



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

KK

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/021,568 | 12/12/2001 | Ran Kohen | 734-A01-019 | 9278 |
| 27130 | 7590 | 12/04/2003 | EXAMINER | |
| EITAN, PEARL, LATZER & COHEN ZEDEK LLP 10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 1001 NEW YORK, NY 10020 | | | ABRAMS, NEIL | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2839 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021588

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-14-03
- ☒ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 4, 7-21 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 7-21 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Claims 8, 9, 11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8, line 4 is unclear, after "around" should --the axis of-- be added; claims 9, 11, 14, dependencies are incorrect.

Claims 7-10, 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as obvious over Mathauser.

For claim 7, Mathauser, figs. 1-6, discloses a system with a socket F having concentric receptacles 16 with conductive inserts 18 joined to a power supply at 21, 22 and a plug M with prong rings 34 engageable with the concentric receptacles. For claim 8, figs. 2, 4, 6, parts 25, 39, 40 form a mechanical connection. For claim 9, note earth connection in fig. 6 at G. For claim 10, magnetic parts 25, 39, 40 form a latch mechanism. Claims 12-21 are also rejected using Mathauser applied as above.

While 35 USC 102 appears proper for each claim, should issues arise, recited features considered obvious variations. For claims 7, 15, 17, while Mathauser does not disclose plug being revolvable or for use with an appliance, it seems obvious that the magnetic force would not prevent the plug being turnable on the socket and also obvious that the plug could be used with an appliance that being standard use of a plug. Also note that "to revolve" feature is only required for claims 7-14.

Art Unit: 2839

Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as obvious over Martens.

Martens system includes a socket 51 with concentric recesses having inserts 54, 56 joined to a current source and a plug 20 having conductive rings 25, 26 joined to appliance 14 and revolvable in the recesses. The plug 48 is for power, but should this be at issue, also obvious that the current supplied would be equivalent to a power supply. For claim 8 “mechanical connection” reads on frictional engagement of any parts of the Martens plug/socket. Other claims rejectable on some basis as in above discussions.

Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martens in view of Taylor.

Martens system lacks an earth contact. Taylor shows a ground at 45. Obvious to use such feature at one of the Martens contacts to improve safety from shock.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Mathauser.

Swanson system includes plug 119, socket 105, 157 and latch 133 but lacks recesses and prong rings. These are shown by Mathauser at 34, 16, figs. 1-6. Obvious to use such features in Swanson to provide more engagement area for less resistance drop.

As to arguments presented, Mathauser and Martens are now applied to show use of plugs with concentric prong rings and sockets with concentric receptacles. Also note that claim 8, “mechanical connection” does not require a latching mechanism.

Art Unit: 2839

Claim 4 is allowed.

Claim 11, if dependent from claim 10 would define allowable material.

of claims over Rendano and Ellis teachings

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: For claims 7, 15, 17,

Rendano is not applied since, it would not have been obvious to change the fig. 3 connection means 31, etc for one like those of Mathauser, or Martens since such changes would amount to a complete reworking of the Rendano teachings and hence unobvious. For claim 11, it would not have been obvious to use Ellis or Rendano type latches in Martens or Mathauser systems or to use same in Swanson, along with other changes as discussed above. Swanson, in addition, is not concerned with "quick release" hence teaches away from combination with Ellis type latch.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR


Art Unit: 2839

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number 308-1729.

Abrams/ek

12/01/03


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322